

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O. F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR HIROYUKI WATANABE	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 990559	CONFIRMATION NO. 4409
09/320,271		05/27/1999			
23850	7590	08/21/2002			
		STERMAN & HA	EXAMINER		
1725 K STREET, NW. SUITE 1000				LEE, CALVIN	
WASHIN	GTON, DC	20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2825	
				DATE MAIL ED: 08/21/2002)

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/320,271

Applicant(s)

H. WATANABE et al.

Examiner

Calvin Lee

Art Unit **2825**



- In MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on	the cover sneet with the correspondence address					
Period for R ply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO) EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM					
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	ACATINE MONTHO, THOM					
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no even	t, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the					
mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statute.						
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will e Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the applic 	ation to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this commeaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	nunication, even if timely filed, may reduce any					
Status						
1) X Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Amendment D)					
2a) ☑ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is	non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte (···					
Disposition of Claims						
² 4) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 21</u>	is/are pending in the applica					
4a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from considera					
5)	is/are allowed.					
6) 🛛 Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 21</u>	is/are rejected.					
7)	is/are objected to.					
8)	are subject to restriction and/or election requirem					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are a	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s)	be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a☐ approved b)☐disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Of	fice action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) 🛛 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b) □ Some* c) □None of:						
1. 🗶 Certified copies of the priority documents have been	received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Bureau (PC	nts have been received in this National Stage					
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certif	ied copies not received.					
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority						
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional appli						
15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.					
Attachment(s)	7					
	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)					
5) Minormation disclosure statement(s) (1 10-1445) (aper 10(5):						

Application No: 09/320,271 Docket No: 990559

Page 2

Paper 24 WATANABE et al.

FINAL ACTION

Response to Pre Amendment

1. The IDS filed on 5/24/02 and the amendment of claim 1 in Paper 23, dated July 9, 2002, are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 2. Claims 1-13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Mizuhara* et al. or *Watanabe et al.*
- a) Mizuhara discloses a semiconductor device and its method, comprising the steps of:
- forming an organic SOG layer 9 (as a first insulator) on an oxide film 8 and over a flat substrate's face [Figs. 4-5 and col. 4, lines 25-43]
- introducing impurities B⁺ into the organic SOG layer (so the impurities arrive at the interface between the SOG layer and its underlying oxide), thereby modifying the organic SOG layer 9 to an SOG layer 10 [Fig. 6 and col. 4, lines 45-51]
- forming a via hole 12 in the modified SOG layer using a mask pattern [col. 4, lines 58-62]
- embedding and forming a first conductive layer 13 of copper alloy in the trench [col. 5]

The method can extends to have second, third, and fourth interconnections, as desired, by repeating the above steps [col. 5 line 61 through col. 6 line 62].

- b) Watanabe teaches a fabrication method of a semiconductor device, comprising the steps:
- forming an organic SOG layer 8 (containing 1% of carbon) on an oxide film 5 overlying a substrate 1 [col. 6 lines 1-18]

4

Application No: 09/320,271 Docket No: 990559

Paper 24 WATANABE et al. Page 3

- introducing impurities into the insulating layer [Fig. 4] so the impurities arrive at the interface between the insulating layer and the oxide film [col. 6, line 39 and col. 7, line 32]

Note: the implantation at the interface between organic SOG layer 8 and oxide film 5 prevents modified SOG layer 9 [col. 6, line 53] from being easily peeled off from the oxide film [col. 6, lines 52-59 and col. 7, lines 30-37]

- forming a via hole 10 in the insulation layer [col. 8 lines 52-63]
- embedding and forming a first conductive layer 11 over the trench [Fig. 5 and col. 7 lines 9-29]

The method can be repeated to form a conventional multi layer structure having second, third, and fourth interconnections, as required.

Although neither *Mizuhara et al.* nor *Watanabe et al.* teaches or suggests a trench, their via holes are equivalent to a claimed trench for subsequent interconnect formation. As a result, both *Mizuhara et al* and *Watanabe et al.* inherently teaches a trench formed in an insulating layer

Response to Arguments

3. The rejection under 35 USC 112 in the last Office Action is most since the fourth-time amended claim 1 no longer refers to a trench.

Applicant's argument, that *Mizuhara* or *Watanabe* fails to teach that the first insulating layer is formed on a flat underlying face over a substrate, is unpersuasive. First of all, the specification supports no such feature. Secondly Examiner notes that *Watanabe* suggests forming an SOG by a conventional method [col. 6]: "the alcohol based solution coating is formed thick at the concave portion and thin at the convex portion with respect to the step-graded portion on single crystal silicon substrate 1 to alleviated the unevenness", wherein a new-formed SOG film

Application No: 09/320,271 Docket No: 990559

Paper 24 WATANABE et al. Page 4

has a flat surface regardless of its underlying film/feature. Moreover, Examiner notes that Applicant suggests also the same method of forming SOG film 3 on page 8, lines 3-11.

Hence, Applicants' argument is moot in light of a final rejection.

4. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire three months from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within two months of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the three-month shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than six months from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Calvin Lee* at (703) 306-5854 from 7 to 17 ET (Monday through Thursday). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, Art Unit 2825's Supervisory Patent Examiner *Matthew Smith* whose telephone number is (703) 308-1323.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0596. The fax phones are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After-Final communications.

CL

August 19, 2002